

REMARKS

Upon the entry of this amendment, claims 32-42 will be pending. Applicants respectfully disagree with the March 10, 2005 Office Action's rejection of claims 1-14, 23, 26-31, 43-66. However, for the sole purpose of facilitating prosecution, Applicants are canceling these claims and the withdrawn claims (claims 1-31 and 43-66), and will be filing them in a continuing application.

Claims 32-42 are deemed to be not obvious, and patentable over the prior art. Further, Examiner Jiang confirmed with Applicants' representative in a telephonic communication that the double patenting rejection does not apply to claims 32-42.¹

In view of the foregoing, Applicants assert that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and an early Office Action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Quan L. Nguyen
Registration No. 46,957

Date: June 10, 2005

COZEN O'CONNOR
1900 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: (215) 665-2158

¹ The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is over the claims in US Patent Nos. 5,780,497 and 5,880,137. However, the Office Action deems that claims 32-42 are not obvious over US Patent Nos. 5,780,497 and 5,880,137. Accordingly, there should be no obviousness-type double patenting rejections made for claims 32-42 with respect to US Patent Nos. 5,780,497 and 5,880,137.